DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 172 FL 012 778

AUTHOR Castro, Raymond E.
TITLE The Influence of Educational Policy on Language Issues.
INSTITUTION Creative Services, Forestville, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 81
NOTE 42p.; Appendices not included because of poor reproducibility.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Alaska Natives; *American Indian Education; *Bilingual Education; *Educational Policy; International Relations; *International Studies; *Language Planning; Language Research; Language Variation; *Second Languages
IDENTIFIERS Guam; Puerto Rico

ABSTRACT

This paper examines three policy areas -- foreign language and international studies, bilingual education, and Indian education. The intention is to clarify and critically analyze the influence of educational policy on language issues. If both foreign language/international studies and bilingual education were incorporated into a larger language planning effort based on a realistic assessment of the future, both could be evaluated against one criterion -- the ability of Americans to survive amidst rapidly changing world affairs. Recommendations include: (1) Congress and the Department of Education should identify those aspects of current educational policy relating to national language issues; (2) the Department of Education should incorporate bilingual education project aimed at preparing Americans for survival in international affairs; (3) a Congressional language planning body should be developed to promote a national language planning project; (4) the Department of Education should establish the mechanism to develop regional variations based on local needs and the distribution of specific linguistic communities; and (5) the body should recognize the contractual relationship existing between the federal government and Indian tribes, Alaskan natives, and the people of Puerto Rico and Guam, and provide assistance when appropriate. (JK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED212172

DRAFT

THE INFLUENCE OF EDUCATIONAL POLICY ON LANGUAGE ISSUES

by

Raymond E. Castro

January 1981

Creative Services
6824 Covey Road
Forestville, CA 95436

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

NOTE: The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to contract No. NIE-P-81-0008 of the National Institute of Education. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the views of that agency.

FL012778

"We shall one day learn to supersede politics by education"
-Ralph Waldo Emerson-

INTRODUCTION

The history of educational social policy in the United States, according to David K. Cohen, is characterized by a sense of loss: "Loss has been a central, though rather episodic, preoccupation in U.S. social policy."[1] He explains that this sense of loss, shared by traditional conservatives and liberal democrats alike, takes the form of longing for the values and loyalties of times past. Traditional conservatives long for the resurgence of social institutions like family and community and see educational policies and programs aimed at re-establishing order as vital steps toward that end. Liberal democrats for their part also lament the erosion of community values but place their hope in policies which contribute to social and economic equality.

The most curious aspect of this tradition of longing is that it has persisted for so long. This sense of loss is no less strong today than it was when Henry Barnard, a leading figure in the New England School Reform Movement, deplored "the example and teaching of lowbred idleness... in the densely populated sections of large cities, and all manufacturing villages...The deficient household

arrangements and deranged machinery of domestic life."[2] A modernized version of this argument was used with considerable success to appeal to countless voters in the 1980 elections. Why has America not overcome its sense of loss? And in terms of educational policies, what accounts for America's inability to rekindle the values so many believe are critical to survival?

The National Insitute of Education (NIE) has as one of its missions the analysis of policies and programs supported by the Department of Education (DOE). The notion of loss is applicable to this mission, for it has characterized the debate surrounding a controversial development in educational social policy: DOE's role in the promotion of language other than English in the United States. Because of recent and widespread attention given to the teaching of languages other than English in public schools, NIE has identified three policy areas for investigation: foreign language and international studies, bilingual education and Indian education. This paper will examine these three policy areas with the intention of bringing clarification and critical analysis to the influence of educational policy on language issues. Language as a distinct policy concern will be examined; a section on language policy implications will conclude this discussion.

LANGUAGE AS A POLICY IN THE UNITED STATES

Shirley B. Heath reminds us that in early U.S. legislative history Thomas Jefferson pointed to language as a policy concern worthy of

congressional attention.[3] And yet Jefferson's admonitions were ignored. It would be inaccurate to speak of this decision as a trend setter, but Congress did not then realize the importance of delineating a clear policy and plan for language in the United States. This situation has changed little in two hundred years.

In reviewing the history of language related policies and program in the U.S.,[4] the most irresistable temptation is to lump together the pieces of legislation and litigation under the category of

language policy. But giving in to such a temptation would only obscure already murky waters. There are cases, in American legislative history, which relate directly to the promotion or denial of language rights for certain groups. Congress authorized New Mexico, for example, to accommodate the Spanish-speaking citizens of the territory shortly after the signing of the US/Mexico treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848. During the second half of the 19th century German predominated among public schools in the midwest. In 1913, however, California legislators passed a law aimed at Asian immigrants; it required English literacy as a prerequisite for ownership of property. As a sequel to granting citizenship to all residents of Puerto Rico in 1917, the United States imposed English as the medium of instruction in island schools. The BIA did the same for Indians enrolled in boarding schools. And in the late fifties, Congress enacted a law designed to encourage the study of foreign languages for the purpose of preserving national security and promoting long range economic development.[5]

This whirlwind review of policy examples related to language groups--far from being indicative of major patterns--does point to some important considerations. Language related policies are almost always directed at certain groups rather than the language needs of Americans as a whole. Policies directed at certain groups are a function of prevailing attitudes towards the group.[6] German sociologist, Heinz Kloss, discussed the need to differentiate between native and immigrant groups. In this regard, Kloss maintains that group rights should vary according to a group's ability to demonstrate a commitment to native language and culture. Within this framework, a group is entitled to promotion rights (i.e.,

policies which support the maintenance of group language and culture) if it demonstrates a loyalty to language and culture over several generations. Recent immigrants and groups less committed, on the other hand, can make no claim to promotion rights; such groups possess tolerance rights alone. But if this discussion of groups rights has an abstract or theoretical ring to it, it is because most of us intuitively believe that policies related to group expression are influenced more by political expediency than by any regard for social justice. Politics, racial bias and economic self-interest are somehow more convincing motives and explain in part the pendulum-like swings characteristic of policies aimed at linguistic minorities.[7]

To observe that language related policies are political, however, explains little. Language is political as social policy itself is political. Both the results of a political process. Our analysis at this point requires further clarification: The issue is not whether policy about language is political; but rather <u>given</u> that it is political, what difference that has made in the formulation of necessary and appropriate social policy. Some definitions are in order.

It is helpful to think of social policy as a formal decision.[8] This is not to demean the influence of informal decisions; casual acts can have great impact, to be sure. A principal's failure to translate notices to Chinese-speaking parents, for example, can do much to strain school-community relations. But this act is not the result of a formal decision - unless the School Board and/or principal take an official stance on the question of languages used in

notices to parents. The School Board could decide not to translate the notices to other languages. This decision not to adopt a policy is of course formal and telling of the Board's relationship with certain segments of the community. Our definition of social policy must include formal decisions and non-decisions which affect the public welfare. There is no policy declaring English the official language of the United States. Is this the result of a formal non-decision? Public welfare encompasses all aspects of formal decision-making (or non-decision making) related to maintenance and promotion of society's well being.

Conceiving of policy in this way allows us to broaden our understanding of those diverse aspects of society which influence its well being. The more conventional public v. private policy distinction, for example, is useful in sorting out the ways money is generated, but overlooks the fact that public and private policy clearly affect one another. Decisions of Corporate Boards in private industry often have direct impact on this public welfare, (e.g., "We will retail gasoline at no less than a dollar".) and elected bodies, like Congress, state legislatures and city councils, repeatedly establish policies which influence the growth patterns of the private sector, (e.g., "We will require environmental impact studies".) Social policy analysis bridges both public and private sectors and targets those policies impinging on the public welfare regardless of their source. This approach also permits the inclusion of organizations like the Ford Foundation or the National Education Association, which defy the public-private distinction, in the analysis of policy-making.

Since the incorporation of all decisions affecting public welfare bites off a sizeable chunk, it is more precise to limit social policy to a practical sphere of influence as in educational social policy. This focuses our attention on the acts of institutional decision-makers. Educational social policy, then, is that set of decisions and non-decisions affecting the public welfare of those involved with educational institutions. Such a distinction aids us in focusing our sights on institutions whose primary function is to create learning environments (e.g., private day care center or state university). At the same time other institutions peripherally involved in the creation of learning environments (e.g., nursing homes with arts and crafts classes) can be excluded from our analysis.[9]

The connection of educational social policy analysis with the institutional experience solves one problem and as readily creates another. For while the limiting of our discussion to educational institutions makes it more manageable, the limitation potentially straps us to a distinct value orientation: that learning is best supported in institutionalized contexts. There are those like Ivan Illich, for example, who have stated that the exact opposite is true.[10] According to this worldview, people learn in spite of institutions not because of them. The educational social policy advocated in this light is to de-institutionalize or "deschool" education and society as a whole. Ideas inherent in this belief are not without foundation. Our educational organizations have tended to over-emphasize the institutions' need for order. The model of school as a factory producing think-alike robots in assembly-line fashion

comes very close to describing most U. S. public schools. The public education system which became a model for schooling the masses has also been the source of much embarrassment. But since students have been compelled to attend school in all 50 states,[11] their lot is to find some semblance of learning within the school environment at least until the age of 16 or so. We should remember that compulsory education was opposed by many conservatives in the late 19th century who felt that the government was meddling too deeply into the private affairs of citizens. In the end it was a coalition of conservatives, fearful that the social order necessary for economic progress would crumble, and liberal social engineers which made attendance at school compulsory.[12] Public schooling is without a doubt an institutionalized approach to education, and it is our reality. Policies that influence this reality, educational social policies, thus are worthy of our attention.

LANGUAGE DECISIONS ≠ LANGUAGE POLICY

Language, like education, encompasses a practical sphere of influence within social policy. Rubin has described the dimensions of language policy and planning in other countries.[13] Language has not received similar attention in the United States. Social policies aimed at linguistic minorities, by way of contrast, have proliferated at all levels of American government. Yet these policies touched upon language almost as unanticipated results of efforts to influence linguistic minority groups in economic, education or governmental spheres. Language tolerance or discrimination has been a means to

other more complex ends. The specific nature and motivation behind these ends is discussed elsewhere.[14] For now it is sufficient to underscore a fundamental distinction: language-related policies, regardless of number, do not by themselves comprise a language policy for the United States. Educational social policy has been presented as a clearly identifiable form of organizational decision making; no such counterpart exists for language in the United States. A formal language policy could lend direction to the actions of federal agencies, provide impetus to similar decision making at the local level and assist citizens with individual, family and community decisions related to language. But if, despite these benefits, we have no such policies, then perhaps the perceived need for formalized language policies in the United States is minimal. Rubin has stated, for example, that "...a powerful rationale for foreign language acquisition has not yet been demonstrated."[15] A review of the three educational social policies related to language will help to explain this.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Congressman Paul Simon has just released a book entitled: The Tongue-Tied American Confronting the Foreign Language Crisis.[16] Press releases describe the book as an analysis of the decline in language skills that harms America culturally and causes severe security and economic losses. The ever-present Publisher's Weekly quote says: "Fascinating and frightening. A very important book."[17] Simon's book comes on the heels of a report prepared by the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies (CFLIS). The report, delicately titled Strength Through Wisdom, makes the same case--if somewhat less dramatically--for renewed interest in foreign language

learning. "Nothing less is at issue," the report maintains, "than the nation's security."[18]

Both of these documents conclude with very specific recommendations concerning the revival of national attention toward the study of foreign languages and international studies. What is striking about these recommendations, however, is their common sensical nature. One's reaction to almost every suggestion is to say: "Yes, of course!" In fact, it is difficult to imagine anyone who has paid even partial attention to world affairs not being in favor of such recommendations as: Schools, colleges and universities should reinstate foreign language requirements" or "or the U. S. government should achieve 100% compliance in filling positions designated as requiring foreign language proficiency...."[19] But despite their obviousness, the recommendations represent a controversy. The fact that their case needs to be made so forcefully is ample evidence. What accounts for our collective awareness? As a nation we have refused to accept that a world, made smaller by mass communication and technology, has caused its people to become interdependent. Or is it not so much that we refuse but that we dare not accept this reality? Which political motivations prompt this? What are the implications of not communicating actively with our neighbors throughout the world? How high are the stakes?

A California junior high school teacher recently observed that the current lack of interest in foreign languages is directly related to our manner of teaching and promoting those languages. "The proof came," he said, "when students were no longer required to take language courses in high school and college. As soon as students

got a choice, they opted out of foreign language classes in record number."[20] Perhaps our junior high school teacher puts excessive responsibility for the general disinterest in foreign languages on the backs of teachers and their methodologies. One thing is clear, however, few people who experience foreign language classes in U. S. public schools can claim fluency in the target language.

The explanation for this lack of mastery must be attributed, in part at least, to our teaching methodology. CFLIS, for example, begins its list of recommendations with the proposal to establish regional centers--the specific purpose of which is to upgrade foreign language teaching. But beyond teaching methodologies, we need to confront our attitude toward foreign languages and the groups they represent. The study of foreign language and international studies traditionally has been the investigation of far-off lands, cultures and people. This element of distance has transformed such studies into the pursuit of curious information applicable to life only in the most abstract and or theoretical sense. Dialogues and descriptions of Spanish windmills, Israeli folkdances and Chinese dragons are examples of limited efforts.

What results from this approach is amply documented elsewhere.[21] Two specific consequences are worthy of emphasis: 1) students as a whole fail to recognize that our comtemporary world is shrinking due to communications technology and multinational enterprises and 2) linguistic minority students in particular are not encouraged to assume a role of leadership in promoting foreign languages and international studies. CFLIS summarizes this latter consequence

as follows:

> "The melting pot tradition that denigrates immigrants maintenance of their skill to speak their native tongue still lingers, and this unfortunately causes linguistic minorities at home to be ignored as a political asset. ...CFLIS emphasize(s) that a comprehensive language policy ought to recognize this important national resource."22

A popular response to the CFLIS position is the assertion that while all people have a right to retain native languages, there is no public responsibility to promote that right with tax dollars. Noel Epstein, a journalist who gained some notoriety with his policy analysis of Title VII, puts it this way:

> "The central issue would not be the unquestioned importance of ethnicity in individuals' lives, any more than it would be the unquestioned importance of religion in individuals' lives. Nor would it be about the right or the desirability of groups to maintain their languages and cultures. The question would be the federal role. Is it a federal responsibility to finance and promote student attachments to their ethnic languages and cultures, jobs long left to families, religious groups, ethnic organizations, private schools, ethnic publications and others?"23

Epstein addresses his own question by distinguishing between an approach which teaches "each about every" culture and that which instructs "you about yours." "To define language maintenance programs as a way of sustaining and building valuable national language resources, opening other worlds to all (i.e. each about every),"[24] according to Epstein, would be manageable, cost effective and free of social and political issues. Epstein argues against public responsibility for group maintenance of language and culture (i.e. you about yours), capitalizing upon

a currently popular view: Why should the government pay for programs or otherwise involve itself in the affairs of the family, church or community? To the extent that foreign language learning is considered a private matter, Epstein's argument has much validity. Difficulty begins when the learning of foreign languages possesses obvious benefits for the general public welfare. If, as CFLIS argues, nothing less than national security and economic survival are at stake, then shouldn't the public in the form of our governments share some of the moral and financial responsibility for language learning?

Epstein would not, I suspect, be at odds with this point. He favors developing native and target language literacy by continuing with foreign language classes throughout the student's career; he also expresses a willingness to try experimental programs such as the second language "immersion" approach for English-speaking children. But Epstein has unrealistic expectations of success for his suggestions. The foreign language curriculum he proposes, for example, is not unlike our past efforts to promote languages other than English. Even if we extend the amount of instruction time devoted to foreign language teaching, prior experience has taught us that students who have no opportunity to employ the target language beyond the classroom (diglossic norms) do not retain language skills.[25] We need only to reflect on our own experiences in French, German and Spanish classes to underscore this point.

More importantly, Epstein's willingness to experiment with language learning programs overlooks contemporary attitudes toward foreign language learning. A populace will experiment when a perceived need exists; neccessity is still the unchallenged mother of invention. But our citizens currently recognize no such need. Indeed, how could our people really learn about this need? All are products of our own foreign language and world geography classes. Epstein assumes that we as a nation have overcome the deficiencies of our education and have evolved to appreciate what other countries long have recognized as vital to survival: the ability to communicate with the rest of the world. This assumption is unfounded.

In 1958, Congress entrusted the Federal Government with the responsibility of promoting the study of foreign languages and international affairs. Prompted by Russian advances in aerospace research, Congress pumped money into colleges and universities for the partial support of students willing to pursue appropriate majors. The legislation, known as the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) managed to attract initial attention but did not contribute to continued interest in meeting a national need. The purpose of NDEA quickly fell out of public view. Institutions of higher education tended for the most part to use NDEA funds as another source of miscellaneous financial aid for needy students.[26]

Political forces during the initial stages of negotiations over NDEA had not seen clear to include provisions for a massive public education effort on the actual need to dedicate ourselves to foreign

languages and international studies. Congress found institutions to accept additional revenues, but underestimated public awareness of NDEA's purpose and need.

Epstein would have us re-live the NDEA experience, for despite some useful suggestions he misses a critical mark: the need for an unprecedented public awareness campaign. More critical still is Epstein's insistence that the current bilingual/multicultural education effort has given excessive emphasis to employing the native language as a medium of instruction. Epstein is preoccupied with the legality of the Lau mandate. The more basic issue is whether it makes policy/political sense to use languages this way. Can we withstand the NDEA experiment for another 25 years? If, as CFLIS argues, linguistic minorities are a valuable asset, can we afford not to take advantage of this national resource?

We know that languages will be learned if they are used. Currently we have communities which reflect the language and culture of nations critical to our survival (e.g., Mexico, China, and Israel). Bilingual education faces many problems,[27] but at least its supporters have attempted to increase our willingness to respect and learn from the residents of these linguistic communities. We do well to heed their advice - for our sake.

The Department of Education has a basic responsibility to see that our nation's citizens are prepared for a changing future. Foreign languages and international studies will play a vital role in that future.

As the CFLIS report proposes, much more can and should be done.

Significant progress will be made if DOE/NIE can assist Congress and the new administration to confront our lack of preparedness without appealing to a compulsive sense of loss. According to Cohen, we have accomplished little in the way of social policy needs by relying on a sense of loss as a rationale for progress.[28] Fear of losing military strength, national pride and traditional family values may make for some interesting--even successful politics--but it has not met our needs. Perhaps, as Cohen suggests, we moderns are socialized to think in terms of longing for the past. Racial and ethnic groups, for example, are quick to describe problems in terms of losses: language and culture. Is this too a product of the modern psyche? To shift from a loss mentality to an acceptance of our changing reality is the challenge we face. The third world may very well provide global leadership in the future.[29] Can we set free our sense of loss in the hope of achieving new insight and long range survival? Are we prepared to accept a different role in world politics by viewing people of color both abroad and at home with more sensitive lenses? Do we really have another choice?

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Albert Shanker, longtime president of the American Federation of Teachers, recently concluded that bilingual education is a disaster.[30] His recommendation was that we scrap the use of native languages in the classroom and get to the business of transitioning kids to English as soon as possible. Shanker implied further in his uniquely gentle way that bilingual education was a waste of money, time and energy, since past immigrants to the U.S. have survived the school

experience with few scars.

This assessment of bilingual education is a major source of controversy--one which centers on differing perceptions about the record of accomplishment of bilingual education programs. The evaluative research which exists about the effectiveness of bilingual education is both scanty and lacking in definitiveness. NIE and the Office of Bilingual Education have recognized this deficiency and are creating a national center for bilingual education research.[31] While more research will be forthcoming, a question remains: Against what criteria will the accomplishments of bilingual education be judged? Shanker, for example, believes bilingual education is a disaster because kids aren't learning English fast enough. Others call for more success in maintenance of native language and culture.[32] Can both be right or are these objectives incompatible?

Two underlying issues shed light on the question of appropriate criteria for evaluating bilingual education programs: 1) the departure of bilingual education methods from conventional language policy in schools and 2) the identification of bilingual education as a political wedge for Latinos.

As dictated in most state codes, the language of instruction in public schools is English. This trend began during World War I when anti-German sentiment was widespread. Prior to the first World War, bilingual education approaches--use of native languages other than English--were actually required in some states. The

change in school language policy was supported by a dramatic turnabout in public opinion. Native language maintenance was associated with the preservation of native cultural values, and that was no longer considered a good idea.[33]

Popular attitudes held that recent immigrants who comprised the bulk of urban poor were in need of a basic education: English literacy and the inculcation of American values. This basic education could be provided to all immigrants through the employment of standardized English language curricula. Native language instruction, it was declared, was no longer the responsibility of the schools. A depression and another world war made the teaching of languages other than English virtually unpatriotic. This attitude has prevailed despite federal legislation, pertinent litigation and amendments to several state codes allowing the use of other languages as media of instruction.

The political debates over this aspect of bilingual education prompted amending Title VII, the Bilingual Education Act, to specify the transitional character of the legislation.[34] A report of the National Advisory Council on bilingual education states that "overall federal policy regarding bilingual education has generally focused on the use of native language instruction as a means of helping eligible students overcome their inadequate command of English."[35] Critics were not appeased by the specifying nature of recent amendments to Title VII. Epstein, for example, questioned the use of native languages to teach English on the grounds that no evidence exists to justify this instructional strategy.[36]

Epstein was not alone in his criticism.[37]

In contrast, bilingual education supporters who also recognized the need for more research, pointed to the negative consequences of the long-tried sink or swim approach. Employment of the native language is the focus of controversy and has muddled the central purpose of bilingual education. From the standpoint of language planning concerns, a clear statement of objectives based on careful review of student needs and programmatic options was never formulated. Rubin has suggested, for example, that:

> "In order to improve our approach to language correction, we need to have more information on the scope of the problem. Hence, in addition to identification of the problem, we need to assess the depth of need. We should have known in advance how many students had limited English skills or what kind of foreign language skills were needed before going into programmatic development."38

More information on linguistic inadequacies was and is continually needed. But the political realities which account for the passage of Title VII in 1967, for example, forced the issue of ethnic group rights to overshadow planning concerns. It is reasonable to conclude, in retrospect, that bilingual education was intended primarily to address the social and economic inequalities of Hispanic Americans.* Title I, Compensatory Education, had caused the the investment of sizable federal dollars to go to predominantly

* Note: The author is aware of the participation of other language groups (e.g. Chinese, Filipino and Indochinese); the purpose here is to clarify legislative intent.

Black schools for supplementary teachers, materials and support staff. Latino, mainly Chicano, leaders, viewed Title VII as an opportunity to even the score with their communities.[39] Alan Pifer, President of the education-minded Carnegie Corporation, puts it this way:

> "Bilingual education is no longer regarded strictly as an educational measure but also as a strategy for realizing the social, political and economic aspirations of Hispanic peoples."40

Is Title VII aimed at linguisitic inadequacies or civil rights?[41] Pifer continues:

> "...bilingual education, as a vehicle for heightening respect and recognition of native languages and culture, for fighting discrimination against non-English speaking groups, and for obtaining jobs and political leverage, has become the pre-eminent civil rights issue within hispanic communities."42

Pifer accepts political influence of hispanics on bilingual education and points to some positive outcomes for Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Cubans and other Latinos: greater social mobility and economic security, stimulated parent participation in schools, gains in status for the Spanish language and increased participation in political office. Not all observers of Title VII politics, however, are as readily inclined to accept its consequences. Epstein has described the idea "that the federal government should finance and promote pupil attachments to their ethnic languages and histories"[43] as affirmative ethnicity. This bilingual bicultural policy, according to Epstein, is a significant expression of the ethnic political movement surfacing throughout the world. He argues that this poses a painful dilemma:

> "Any federal funds spent to maintain the native languages of students who are proficient or dominant in English takes these limited resources from children who cannot learn English and who therefore are most in need."44

Epstein's identification of a rise in ethnic group expression is accurate. Other analysts of ethnic identity, Glazer and Moynihan, agree that:

> "...ethnic identity has become more salient, ethnic self-assertion stronger, ethnic conflict more marked everywhere in the last twenty years, and that the reasons include the rise of the welfare state, the clash between egalitarianism and the differential achievement of norms, the growing heterogeneity of states and the international system of communication."45

But the dilemma raised by Epstein is curious. The need to teach children English with ever diminishing resources is quite real. Equally real is our need to prepare students for survival in a multi-ethnic society and international community. The preparation of culturally sensitive, multi-lingual Americans is a national priority critical to our long term survival. Linguistic minorities well grounded in their native language and culture are probably the most valuable resource in the preparation of Americans for a changing future. The teaching and use of strategic languages in the schools is of benefit to all Americans. This one issue, more than any other, needs to be extricated from the flap about bilingual education.

Leaders from Latino communities made use of language legislation

when prior efforts to advance in employment, housing and education as a whole had failed. America's history of ethnic politics made such a move plausible - a fact of political life. And it must be said, that some groups have achieved significant gains - even in language learning - through Title VII. Our mistake was to believe that we could address our society's linguistic inadequacies solely through the implementation of bilingual education in the classroom. As Rubin observes, language in the classroom is only one component of the planning approach needed in the U.S.[46] Yet the attention given to it by the press has converted bilingual education into the most controversial language issue of the decade. The net effect of this attention has been to place the responsibility of correcting our inadequacies exclusively on the backs of our teachers. Schools, though important in the preparation of our future citizens, cannot support the weight of this responsibility alone. The linguistic concerns discussed within the context of bilingual education (e.g. the learning of English as a second language, development of English literary skills, maintenance of native languages and cultures, and the teaching of strategic languages to English dominants) are of interest to us all and must receive attention from institutions other than schools at both the federal and state level.

Bilingual education and the teaching of foreign languages, for example, should be promoted as two strands in a coordinated effort to meet our national language needs. The objective of this coor-

dinated effort is to prepare all of us for a new role in the world - one which requires us to act interdependently on other nations. Our ability to survive in that role is very much in question. The language programs we implement, therefore, must be planned and evaluated with this goal in mind. No other criteria make sense.

To implement a coordinated language planning effort in the U.S., it may be necessary to rid ourselves of previous definitions and nomenclatures. Perhaps our language awareness should begin with the way we describe that which we want to achieve. Bilingual education, as we have discussed, is aimed at more complex objectives than individual bilingualism. Why, then, is it called bilingual education? And foreign language teaching may not be a helpful description either. Some of the languages we call foreign are very much alive in the U.S. (e.g. Spanish and Chinese). Other languages are of strategic use to us (e.g. Russian and languages of the Middle East) and as a result will become less foreign with international military and economic developments. A new thrust in our efforts to correct linguistic inadequacies which centers on strategic languages and international studies may be in order.[47] An umbrella effort in language planning has several immediate purposes:

1) to increase awareness of the need for language preparedness by elevating language to the level of viable social policy;

2) to specify the objectives of current programs based on current language needs;

3) to coordinate current efforts in both bilingual education and foreign language teaching with other language concerns.

We should leave the naming of a national planning effort to the political battlefields. It is clear from past experience, however, that any attempt to meet language needs in the U.S. must be declared a national priority and be accompanied by a massive public education campaign.

INDIAN EDUCATION

In a most fundamental sense, policy on Indian education is distinct from either foreign language/international studies or bilingual education. This is due in part to the unique and contractual relationship between Indian tribes and the federal government. The consequences of this relationship are now being documented.[48] They point to a history of contradictions and inconsistencies in federal policy.[49] One result of these historical conditions is the movement of Indian people throughout the nation to assert both self-determination and tribal sovereignty.[50]

The assertion of self-determination and tribal sovereignty has expressed itself on matters of land, water and mineral rights, health care, employment and education. Education plays a special role, for Indian tradition has always placed great value and emphasis on learning. Spiritual beliefs, tribal government, native language and culture, and the ways of survival have been emphasized

in the learning process.[51] But survival has become more complex and demanding in the course of Indian history. Sound formal education is now more important and all the more difficult to obtain. Indian experiences in BIA schools and public schools have enkindled little faith or respect for government sponsored educational programs. It is enough to observe, for example, that Indian children fare worse in schools by all measures of educational attainment than any other single group.[52]

Even when the federal government attempted to improve education for disadvantaged students (e.g. compensatory education or bilingual education) conditions changed little for Indian students.[53] Since the passage of the Johnson/O'Malley Act in 1937, supplemental funding to meet special Indian needs has made no appreciable difference in the progress of Indian children.[54] Disenchanted with government schools and supported by the rejuvenated interest in educational alternatives during the late 60's, Indians turned to the idea of Indian-controlled schools.

In 1971 the Coalition of Indian Controlled School Boards (CICSB) was established as a national non-profit educational organization. CICSB provides research, training and organizational development services to enhance the quality of education for Indian people. With the passage of PL 93-638, the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act enacted by Congress in 1975, the Coalition has grown to over 170 member school boards, parent advisory committees

and Indian education groups. What these groups share is the belief that the right and responsibility for improving Indian education lay with the tribe and local community. One director of a CICSB school described a glaring aspect of this belief: "When I talk to people about the potential of Indian controlled schools and all else fails to convince them, I get them to think about the past and ask themselves 'Can we really do a worse job?' "[55]

This brutal fact makes the Indian move for tribal sovereignty and self-determination a central consideration in examining language issues within Indian education. We cannot view Indians as a disadvantaged ethnic minority seeking group civil rights. They represent, instead, a varied group of sovereign nations and tribes struggling to keep their spiritual beliefs and land-based culture alive. They hope to accomplish this with the help of Indian controlled schools.

SELECTED WORKS ON THE PURPOSE OF INDIAN-CONTROLLED SCHOOLS

The school for Indian people goes well beyond popular conceptions of education. It differs primarily in its relationship to the community at large. While progressive educational reformers seek to make schools more responsive to community concerns, Indians consider schools the focus of community life[56] and, indeed, the very means of survival for the tribe. As the center of community activity, the school serves as the nucleus for economic and social development.[57] Valued schools in Indian communities appear nothing like those institutions which perform a caretaker role and limit facility usage to classroom activity between the hours of nine to

three. Because education is viewed as the process of preserving the nation, Indian schools use the entire community as classrooms and involve tribal members in the fulfillment of all responsibilities from curriculum development[58] to school administration.[59] The purpose of Indian schools focuses attention on who controls. Because schools hold a critical place in the future survival of the tribe, tribal leaders (e.g. the council or an elected school board or an appointed sub-committee) assume major responsibility for directing the school.[60] Decisions concerning staff hirings, budget and school policy are viewed as the responsibility of tribal representatives; such decisions are often made by consensus.[61]

Community control of schools has more than a symbolic or political value for Indian groups. The assurance of Indian control provides the tribe with mechanisms to promote educational goals vital to the preservation of the nation. These goals include spiritual awareness,[62] the maintenance of native language and culture,[63] the development and understanding of tribal structure,[64] and the provision of skilled people who can provide technical assistance to the tribe.[65] The education of Indian youth is aimed at preserving the nation and preparing young people to survive in Indian and white contexts. Preparation includes the development of an appreciation of self,[66] basic scholastic tools,[67] abilities to think critically and plan effectively,[68] creativity,[69] vocational skills,[70] and behavior/attitudes which foster friendship and kinship.[71]

The learning process itself is addressed by tribal leaders. Student learning requires three elements:

1) building individual pride and dignity;
2) developing ability to relate education to present and future experience; and
3) promoting student progress at individual's pace.[72]

GOALS AND STANDARDS FOR INDIAN-CONTROLLED SCHOOLS

Coalition for Indian Controlled School Boards (CICSB) has advocated for the establishment of means and measures by which to recognize quality Indian education. After the BIA published the PL 95-561 Indian Education Standards in 1979, the concern for this priority intensified. Coalition members expressed disappointment over the Field Draft of the proposed Standards. Not that PL 95-561 standards appeared haphazard; in fact, their quality approached that of the more established accreditation associations. But Task Force Standards seemed to follow established models too closely. The application of conventional standards to Indian controlled efforts have not produced encouraging results in the past. Education when controlled by Indians does not fit the traditional image of public schools. Indian education projects which did receive some professional or bureaucratic approval underwent a strange transformation. This change is described by Mander in terms of television images:

> "I'm sure it has not escaped you that the Black television news commentators, and the Asian ones, as well

> as the women are inseparable in tone of voice phrasing attitudes, style of clothes, over-all shave patterns and apparent political perspectives from the hundreds of white men who preceeded them in those roles. The color and sex are more varied now, but the message is the same. As more diverse people occupy the central control systems, the systems do not become more diverse. The people lose their diversity and start to be transformed by the systems. The systems remain the same. The perceptual patterns that have been excluded remain excluded. If alternatives to the life style of the systems exist, they are not represented."[73]

CICSB has maintained that the educational system like its media counterpart will not become more diverse; its purpose is to produce conformity through the application of established education standards. Collective experiences of the Coalition membership verified this and suggested the need for alternative standards - standards which encourage and support the diversity of Indian beliefs and values. The BIA found it politically wise to provide CICSB with a modest grant to develop such standards.

Tribal concerns such as preserving the tribe as a spiritual entity and sovereign nation currently are promoted by Indian controlled schools in spite of the established norms. Yet, few such schools have received the formal recognition necessary for funding or institutional development. To meet this need, CICSB proposed alternative education standards for Indian controlled schools in 1980; those standards which concern language and culture are presented in Appendix A.

The CICSB-developed education standards for language and culture

(Indian and mainstream) are simply stated. In a straightforward manner, they provide guidelines for the creation of learning environments which give central focus to survival of the tribe, emphasize the importance of spiritual beliefs and intertwine the teaching of native language/culture and mainstream knowledge/skills. Curiously enough CICSB's goal statements are not terribly radical; they seem reasonable and long overdue. Still more telling is the realization that they are not new.

In 1973 the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) published a list of recommendations for language policy in Indian education[74] (see Appendix B). From the central authority of Indian tribes and communities to the use of native languages in the classroom, CAL's recommendations foreshadowed the thrust of the CICSB's education standards. Seven years have passed between the publication of each statement. Did pronouncement of the initial recommmendations fall on deaf ears? Is it fair to assume that little progress has been made in the implementation of recommended actions?

All of this raises a question about the Department of Education's role in Indian education. As we have suggested, there appears to be no scarcity of solid and appropriate recommendations concerning language policy in Indian education. But what happens to these recommendations? Who receives them? Do they spark new actions? How much do they account for relevant policies formulated? How, more specifically, does the Department of Education collect and disseminate such recommendations to those entrusted with policy

making and implementation?

NIE should direct research efforts in Indian education to the assessment of progress made in implementing recommendations like those of CAL and CICSB. In public schools, special attention also should be paid to BIA schools, despite obvious problems of jurisdiction with BIA's Office of Indian Education Programs. Lastly, NIE should establish on-going communication with organizations like CICSB to assist in the recognition and maintenance of Indian controlled schools.

CONCLUSION

This discussion began with a reference to loss as a central theme in U.S. social policy. This theme, we said, has characterized the debate over DOE's role in promoting languages other than English. Conservatives have expressed a loss of old American values, and Liberals have vocalized a loss of our diverse cultural richness and egalitarian values. We argued that this loss mentality has impaired our ability to formulate necessary and appropriate social policy and offered foreign language/international studies and bilingual education as examples. Both policy areas were presented as recent efforts in a consistent history to formulate policy related to language without a guiding plan.

Within the teaching of foreign language and international studies, we cited studies which decry our lack of preparedness. We argued

that past policy efforts have overlooked the fact that Americans have not yet identified the learning of languages other than English as a priority. A recent survey of American attitudes toward foreign languages showed that "while most Americans cannot speak any language but English, half of them wish they could."[75] The learning of foreign languages will become a priority when the wishing half begins to study languages. This will occur when our policy makers promote such learning not because we are losing old tradition or national pride but because we must survive in a changing world.

Bilingual education too has presented us with difficulties in determining our current direction in language policy. We have said that the departure of bilingual education from conventional school language policy and the use of bilingual education as a political wedge for Latinos has presented us with a major controversy: Against what criteria do we judge the effectiveness of bilingual programs? We concluded that we identified unrealistic expectations for language teaching in the classroom. If, as we propose, both foreign language/ international studies and bilingual education were incorporated into a larger language planning effort based not on loss but a realistic assessment of the future, then both could be evaluated against the only criterion which makes sense: the ability of Americans to survive amidst rapidly changing world affairs.

In reference to Indian education, we asserted that it could not

be examined simply as another component of language related policy. This was attributed to the unique contractual relationship between the federal government and Indian tribes. The dismal consequences of this relationship has caused Indians to re-affirm the principles of tribal sovereignty and self-determination. In the educational sphere these principles have taken the form of Indian controlled schools. Organizations like CICSB have been established to oversee the development of Indian controlled schools. The recommendations of these organizations have addressed the language needs of Native Americans in very clear terms. These needs are fundamentally different from those of linguistic minorities in the U.S. Our major challenge, we proposed, is not to identify what needs to be done but to determine how to accomplish that which has been identified. We suggested that NIE can play an important role in that effort.

In light of this analysis, we recommend the following:

1) Congress, with the help of the Department of Education, should re-examine all current educational policy with the purpose of identifying those aspects which relate to national language issues.

2) The Department of Education should incorporate national language issues in education, including bilingual education and foreign language/international studies, into a broader

language education project aimed at preparing Americans for survival in international affairs. The language education project should be declared a national priority.

3) The national language education project should be developed as one component of a comprehensive language planning effort guided by a congressionally recognized body representing a cross section of Americans. The purpose and function of the congressional language planning body should be the object of a massive public education campaign.

4) With the establishment of a congressional language planning body, language policy and planning activities should be undertaken as a decision area related to but distinct from other institutional spheres (e.g. education, health and business).

5) To implement the national language project the Department of Education should establish the mechanism to develop regional variations based on local needs and the distribution of specific linguistic communities.

6) The congressional language planning body should recognize the unique contractual relationship which exists between the federal government and Indian tribes, Alaskan natives and

territorial possessions such as Puerto Rico and Guam and provide assistance when deemed necessary and appropriate by those affected.

7) The evaluation of the national education project and comparable efforts in other spheres should be the responsibility of the congressional language planning body.

8) The research priorities on language education should be re-evaluated in light of the planning activities of the congressional language planning body.[76]

NOTES

1. David K. Cohen, "Loss as a Theme in Social Policy," HER, Volume 46, No. 4 (November 1976), page 554.

2. Henry Barnard, "Sixth Annual Report of the Superintendent of Common Schools to the General Assembly of Connecticut, 1851," Rpt. in Michael B. Katz, School Reform Past and Present, Boston: Little Brown Co., 1971, page 10.

3. See Shirley B. Heath, "A National Language Academy?" Debate in the New Nation," IJSL, Volume II (1976).

4. Arnold H. Leibowitz, "English Literacy as a Sanction for Discrimination," Notre Dame Lawyer, Volume 45, No. 7 (Fall 1969). Is a useful review of language related policies at the federal and state level.

5. This sampling of federal and state policies is taken from Raymond E. Castro, "Title VII - History of the Bilingual Education Act," in Perspective on Chicano Studies, Los Angeles: Aztlan Publications, 1978.

6. Attitudes towards language groups is discussed in Joshua Fishman et al., Language Loyalty in the United States, The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1966.

7. See Arnold H. Leibowitz, "Language as a Means of Social Control" (unpublished manuscript prepared for VIII World Congress of Sociology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, August 1974).

8. For a more extensive definition of social policy in education, refer to Donna H. Kerr, Educational Policy, New York: Davis McKay Co., 1976.

9. Ibid, Chapter One.

10. Ivan Illich explains his view in Deschooling Society, New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

11. For a thorough discussion of the origin of compulsory education, see David B. Tyack, "Ways of Seeing: An Essay on the History of Compulsory Schooling," HER, Volume 46, No. 3 (August 1976).

12. Cohen, op. cit., page 570.

13. Joan Rubin, Directory of Language Planning Organizations, Honolulu: East-West Culture Learning Institute, 1980.

14. See Raymond E. Castro, "Patterns of Acculturation and Assimilation in U.S. Language Policy - A Policy Analysis of Title VII, The Bilingual Education Act" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1976).

15. Joan Rubin, "The Approach to Language Planning Within the U.S.," Language Planning Newsletter, Volume 4, No. 4, November 1978, page 3.

16. Paul Simon, The Tongue-Tied American, New York: Continuum Publishing Corp., 1980.

17. Edwin O. Reischaver, Rpt. in New York Review of Books, Volume XXVIII, Nos. 21 and 22 (January 22, 1981).

18. "Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability," A Report to the President from the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, U.S. Government Printing Office (November 1979), page 1.

19. Ibid, pages 12 and 14.

20. Ken Wright, Seventh Grade Teacher, Santa Clara County, Interview, December 19, 1980.

21. "Strength Through Wisdom," op. cit., pages 1-11.

22. Ibid, page 6.

23. Noel Epstein, Language, Ethnicity and the Schools, Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership, 1977, page 7.

24. Ibid, page 6.

25. This notion is expanded upon in Raymond E. Castro, "Shifting the Burden of Bilingualism," The Bilingual Review, Volume 3, Nos. 1 and 2 (1976).

26. See Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America, New York: Basic Books, 1976, Chapter 8.

27. Many of the problems facing bilingual education are described in Epstein, op. cit., Chapter 1.

28. Cohen, op. cit., page 568.

29. For a discussion of this theme, see William F. Greenbaum, "America in Search of a New Ideal,: HER, Volume 44, No. 2 (August 1974).

30. Albert Shanker, President - American Federation of Teachers, Radio Interview on KGO, San Francisco, October 15, 1980.

31. The Research Center is described in National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education, Annual Report 1979, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.

32. See Jose A. Cárdenas in Epstein, op. cit., pages 71-84.

33. This history is documented in David Tyack, The One Best System, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974.

34. Arnold H. Leibowitz describes the legislature's tendency to give bilingual education a more transitional character in The Bilingual Education Act: A Legislative Analysis, Rosslyn, Virginia: Inter-America Research Associates, 1980.

35. National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education, op. cit., page 16.

36. Epstein, op. cit., pages 15 and 16.

37. See American Institutes for Research, Interim Report, Evaluation of the Impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish/English Bilingual Education Programs, Palo Alto, California: Air, Inc., 1977.

38. Joan Rubin, "The Approach to Language Planning Within the United States," Language Planning Newsletter, Volume 5, No. 1 (February 1979) page 4.

39. Castro develops this issue in "Patterns...," op. cit., Chapter 2.

40. Alan Pifer, "Bilingual Education and the Hispanic Challenge," (reprinted: 1979 Annual Report Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1979), page 5.

41. See Osvaldo J. Romero and Raymond E. Castro, "Title VII: Education or Civil Rights?", C.A.B.E. Research Journal, Volume 1, No. 1 (February 1978).

42. Pifer, op. cit., page 5.

43. Epstein, op. cit., page 3.

44. Ibid, page 27.

45. Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, "Why Ethnicity" in America and the New Ethnicity, Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press Corp., 1979, page 42.

46. Rubin, "Approach to Language...," op. cit., part one.

47. CFLIS proposes the establishment of a private national commision on foreign language and international studies; see Strength Through Wisdom, op. cit., page 139.

48. See "Federal Indian Policies," Bureau of Indian Affairs, U.S. Department of Interior, Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975.

49. This history is documented from an Indian perspective in the periodical Akwesasne Notes, John Mohawk (ed.), Rooseveltown, New York.

50. For an analysis of the terms of self-determination and tribal sovereignty, refer to Michael P. Gross, "Indian Self Determination and Tribal Sovereignty: An Analysis of Recent Federal Indian Policy, Texas Law Review, Volume 56, No. 7 (August 1978).

51. Descriptions of the learning process - how it is and how it should be - are found in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Welfare, "Indian Education: A National Tragedy and a National Challenge," Report No. 91-501, November 1969, 91st Congress.

52. See "Symposium on Indian Education," Inequality in Education, Harvard Center for Law and Education, 1971.

53. This is developed in U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "The Southwest Indian Report," Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, May 1973, pages 23-29.

54. Ibid, page 28.

55. Tom Allen, Executive Director, Little Wound School, Kyle, South Dakota (address given at annual meeting of CICSB, December 5, 1980).

56. D. Adams, "Self-Determination," Journal of American Indian Education, January 1974.

57. P. Fitzgerald and T. Davis, "Menominee County Community School," Journal of American Indian Education, January 1974.

58. Gross, "Indian Self-Determination...," op. cit. and June Deborah Wyatt, Self-Determination Through Education: A Canadian Indian Example, Phi Delta Kappan 1-77.

59. Jerry Bean, "Native Americans and Discrimination in Kansas: Trails From Injustice," article in Kansas Law Review, 20:468. L., 1972.

60. Fitzgerald, "Menominee County Community School," op. cit. and Wyatt, "Self-Determination Through Education...," op.cit.

61. American Indian Education, A Bibliography (with ERIC abstracts ERIC/CRESS Supplement #7. New Mexico State University, University Park. ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. 8-76. page 282.

62. "National Tragedy...," op. cit.

63. Adams, op. cit., and Fitzgerald, op. cit., and Wyatt, op. cit.

64. Gross, op. cit.

65. "National Tragedy...," op. cit.

66. Bean, op. cit., and "National Tragedy...," op. cit.

67. Wyatt, op. cit.

68. Bean, op. cit.

69. "National Tragedy...," op. cit.

70. Fitzgerald, op. cit.

71. Wyatt, op. cit.

72. Fitzgerald, op. cit.

73. Jerry Mander, Four Arguemnts for the Elimination of Television, New York: William Morrow and Co., 1977, page 279.

74. Center for Applied Linguistics, "Recommendations for Language Policy in Education," Arlington, Virginia: CAL, 1972.

75. Peter A. Eddy, "Foreign Languages in the USA: A National Survey of American Attitudes." Modern Language Journal (Spring 1980) page 58.

76. For a useful review of proposed research priorities, see Heidi Dulay and Marina Burt, "Research Priorities in Bilingual Education," Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis, Volume 1, No. 3 (May-June 1979).